Comment on

"Global Structure of the Kerr Family of Gravitational Fields"

H. García-Compeán and V. S. Manko

Departamento de Física, Centro de Investigación y de Estudios Avanzados del IPN,

A.P. 14-740, 07000 México D.F., Mexico

arXiv:1410.4671v1 [gr-qc] 17 Oct 2014

Abstract

We comment on the role of the Cartesian-type Kerr-Schild coordinates in developing a faulty maximal extension of the Kerr-Newman solution in the well-known paper of Carter.

PACS numbers: 04.20.Jb, 04.70.Bw, 97.60.Lf

In his famous paper [1], Carter generalized the results of Boyer and Lindquist [2], obtained for the Kerr solution [3], to the case of the Kerr-Newman (KN) spacetime [4]. Among various important discoveries made in [1], one should of course mention the writing of the KN metric in the canonical form with only one non-diagonal component, and a complete integration of the Hamilton-Jacobi equation for the geodesics. At the same time, Carter's approach to the maximal extension of the KN solution, which involves, like in the Kerr case [2], a continuation of the radial coordinate r to infinite negative values and the essential use of the disk geometry of the surface $r = 0$, $t =$ constant (henceforth referred to as the $r = 0$ surface for simplicity) has been recently invalidated by the rigorous proof [5] that the latter two-surface is not a disk. The present comment deals with answering an interesting and natural question of why for nearly fifty years the surface $r = 0$ of the KN solution has been given a wrong interpretation.

Suppose we have some stationary solution of the field equations defined by a metric written in the Boyer-Lindquist-like coordinates $\{r, \theta, \varphi, t\}$, whose surface $r = 0$ may in principle have an arbitrary geometry yet to be identified. Then, with the idea to "attain a better insight" of the geometrical properties of the solution, let us make a coordinate change, introducing the Cartesian-type coordinates $\{x, y, z, t'\}$ via the formulas

$$x + iy = (r + ia)e^{i\varphi'(\varphi,r)} \sin\theta, \quad z = r\cos\theta, \quad t' = t'(t, r), \tag{1}$$

where a is a rotation parameter. An immediate corrolary of (1) are two equations,

$$x^2 + y^2 = (r^2 + a^2)\sin^2\theta \quad \text{and} \quad z^2 = r^2\cos^2\theta, \tag{2}$$

whence we first readily obtain the relation

$$\frac{x^2 + y^2}{r^2 + a^2} + \frac{z^2}{r^2} = 1, \tag{3}$$

which, when $r \neq 0$, shows that the surfaces $r =$ constant are confocal ellipsoids, and then, in the limit $r = 0$, we yield the equations

$$x^2 + y^2 = a^2\sin^2\theta, \quad z = 0, \tag{4}$$

defining a disk of radius $|a|$ in the equatorial $z = 0$ plane.

Therefore, the coordinate transformation (1), which was first proposed in Kerr's celebrated paper [3] and nowadays better known under the name of the Kerr-Schild transformation, is a remarkable invention indeed, as it permits one to convert in a magic way any

unknown surface $r = 0$ of arbitrary geometry into a disk (4), without even writing a concrete metric explicitly! It is no surprise, then, that the above very simple and seemingly efficient procedure of identifying the surface $r = 0$ as a disk was employed not only for the analysis of the Kerr geometry by Boyer and Lindquist [2], but also by Carter in the KN asymptotically flat case [1], and in the asymptotically non-flat case of stationary black holes in the presence of the cosmological constant (see, e.g., [6]). We would like to emphasize that, surprisingly, nobody has put in doubt the absolutely formal "disk" interpretation of the surface $r = 0$ springing up from the transformation (1).

It is remarkable that in the case of the KN solution the disk geometry of the two-surface $r = 0$ can be easily refuted by calculating its Gaussian curvature K; this has been first done in our paper [5], resulting in the following expression:

$$K = Q^2 F(\theta), \tag{5}$$

where Q is the charge parameter, and $F(\theta)$ is a function of θ whose explicit form may be found in [5]. Since it is well known that the Gaussian curvature of a disk is equal to zero, it is clear from (5) that the Cartesian Kerr-Schild coordinates actually fail to supply us with a correct description of the surface $r = 0$. It is worth mentioning that essentially all stationary black-hole solutions with a cosmological constant turn out to have the $r = 0$ surface of nonzero Gaussian curvature [7], thus providing additional examples of particular nondisk geometries of that two-surface in the spacetimes different from the KN one.

One might think, however, that at least in the case of the Kerr solution the disk interpretation of the surface $r = 0$ supplied by the Cartesian coordinates must be correct because the Gaussian curvature of the latter surface for the Kerr solution is known to be equal to zero [8] (this result also follows from (5) by setting $Q = 0$). Unfortunately, even this "very obvious" case is nothing more but a subtle mathematical puzzle, the resolution of which requires the analysis of the surface $r = 0$ in the Weyl-Papapetrou cylindrical coordinates and recalling that a disk is not the only two-surface possessing zero Gaussian curvature; then we must finally interpret the surface $r = 0$ of the Kerr solution as a dicone [5].

Therefore, the main conclusion that could be drawn from the above consideration is that the Kerr-Schild coordinates (1) seem to bear principle responsibility for a fifty-year delay in our understanding of the true global structure of the stationary black-hole solutions. With the discovery of the genuine geometry of the surface $r = 0$ of the latter solutions, the

elaboration of the corresponding correct maximal analytic extensions will be, hopefully, not long in coming.

Acknowledgments

This work was partially supported by the Research Project 128761 from CONACyT of Mexico.

---

[1] B. Carter, Phys. Rev. **174**, 1559 (1968).

[2] R. H. Boyer and R. W. Lindquist, J. Math. Phys. **8**, 265 (1967).

[3] R. P. Kerr, Phys. Rev. Lett. **11**, 237 (1963).

[4] E. Newman, E. Couch, K. Chinnapared, A. Exton, A. Prakash and R. Torrence, J. Math. Phys. **6**, 918 (1965).

[5] H. García-Compeán and V. S. Manko, arXiv:1205.5848 (submitted to General Relativity and Gravitation).

[6] B. Carter, in: Black Holes (Gordon and Breach, New York, 1973) p. 56.

[7] V. S. Manko and H. García-Compeán, Phys. Rev. D **90**, 047501 (2014).

[8] B. O'Neill, Elementary Differential Geometry (Academic Press, New York, 1966).